

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the current subject matter is respectfully requested.
No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-20 and 25-28 stand rejected under 35 USC § 101 because allegedly the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a computer-implemented method, thereby obviating the rejection of claims 1-20. Claim 25 has been amended to recite "A computer-readable storage medium having tangibly embodied thereon a computer program" to clarify that the recited subject matter does not cover a propagated signal to obviate the rejection of claims 25-28.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this basis for objection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC §§ 102 / 130

Claims 1, 5-19, 21 and 25 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Srimuang (U.S. pre-grant publication number 2003/0061087. Claims 2, 20, 22, and 26 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srimuang in view of Mahapatro U.S. Patent No. 6,571,215. Claims 4, 24 and 28 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srimuang in view of Mahapatro and in further view of Official Notice. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite: "associating based on user input, resource information with task items that need to be completed as part of performing a service action by an engine; and polling a first repository of resource information associable with the task

items, the repository including human resource information, reusable resource information, and non-reusable resource information, wherein: the human resource information includes availability information for human resources, the reusable resource information includes availability information for reusable resources, the non-reusable resource information includes availability information for non-reusable resources; polling a remote computer system different than the first repository to obtain non-resource constraint information for the service action; and scheduling resources needed to perform the service action based on results obtained from the repository of resource information as limited by the non-resource constraint information obtained from the remote computer system.” (for support, see, *inter alia*, page 6, line 7 to page 7, line 19. previous claims 2, 3).

Srimuang describes an arrangement in which a third party external to an organization may schedule resources associated with that organization (see, *inter alia*, Srimuang par. 13). In one example, a patient may schedule an appointment with a doctor's office that will require a nurse, an examination room, an x-ray room, and a doctor. Rather than having the doctor's office determine availability of such resources, the user can make such selection directly. With such an arrangement, only a single calendaring system is being utilized as the user can define his or her own constraints. In contrast, claim 1, as recited, describes an arrangement in which a remote computer system that differs from a repository is polled to obtain non-resource constraint information. While Mahopatro is alleged to disclose non-resource constraint data, the combination of Srimuang with Mahopatro fail to disclose or suggest that non-resource constraint data is obtained by polling a remote computer as recited. In fact, Mahopatro simply describes a single source of task information and limitations on assigning a resource to a task - and such information is defined by the corresponding task. Non-resource constraint information as recited in the claim which is separate from tasks

defined by a service request as well as a separate repository or computing system as recited are not suggested or disclosed by the cited reference.

Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be allowable.

New claim 29 recites: "receiving a request to schedule a service request, the service request comprising a plurality of tasks; polling a first repository to associate each task with at least one of a person, a non-reusable resource, and a reusable resource; polling a second repository remote from the first repository to determine whether there are any non-resource constraints limiting when the service order can be schedule; determining a time slot within a time range defined by the non-resource constraints in which the associated persons, non-reusable resources, and reusable resources are also available; and scheduling the service order during the time slot." (for support, see, *inter alia*, page 6, line 7 to page 7, line 19).

Claim 29 is also allowable based on similar reasoning to claim 1.

New claim 30 recites: "rendering, on a client computer, a graphical user interface, the graphical user interface presenting a user with a generic service order template for a service requested by the service request, the generic service order template comprising a collection of reusable data that identifies each of the tasks to be performed for the service requests, and for each task, a predetermined, expected duration of the task and an identification of other tasks on which the tasks depends; receiving user-generated input modifying the generic service order template; and initiating the scheduling of the service request based on the modified generic service order template." (for support, see, *inter alia*, page 6, line 7 to page 7, line 19, page 14, lines 9-31).

Claim 30 is also separately allowable as none of the cited references suggest or disclose a generic service order template as recited in claim 30 nor the corresponding GUI.

Concluding Comments

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment. Applicant asks that all claims be allowed.

If there are any questions regarding these amendments and remarks, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Reference No. 34874-374.

Respectfully submitted,



Carl A. Kukkonen, III
Reg. No. 42,773

Date: March 11, 2008

Address all written correspondence to:
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
5355 Mira Sorrento Place, Suite 600
San Diego, CA 92121
Customer No. 64280
Phone: 858.320.3000
Fax: 858.320.3001